

# THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

Published Weekly at Raleigh, N. C.

MRS. L. L. POLK, Proprietor  
CLARENCE H. POE, Editor.  
BENJAMIN IRBY, Corresponding  
FRANK E. EMERY, Editors.  
J. W. DENMARK, Business Manager.

## SUBSCRIPTION

Single Subscription One Year, \$1.00  
" Six Months, .50  
" Three Months, .25

"THE INDUSTRIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR PEOPLE PARALLEL TO ALL OTHER CONSIDERATIONS OF STATE POLICY," is the motto of The Progressive Farmer, and upon this platform it shall rise or fall. Serving no master, ruled by no faction, circumscribed by no selfish or narrow policy, its aim will be to foster and promote the best interests of the whole people of the State. It will be true to the instincts, traditions and history of the Anglo-Saxon race. On all matters relating specially to the great interests it represents, it will speak with no uncertain voice, but will fearlessly the right defend and impartially the wrong condemn. From Col. Polk's Salutatory, Feb. 10, 1886

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER is the Official Organ of the North Carolina Farmers' State Alliance.

When sending your renewal, be sure to give exactly the name on label and postoffice to which the copy of paper you receive is sent.

DISCONTINUANCES—Responsible subscribers will continue to receive this journal until the publishers are notified by letter to discontinue, when all arrears must be paid. If you do not wish the journal continued for another year after your subscription has expired, you should then notify us to discontinue it.

## Editorial.

VOL. XVI.

Last week The Progressive Farmer entered its sixteenth volume. The year just past has been a good one with us and we enter the new volume with bright prospects.

If we know our own heart, we desire only to keep the paper in the path of independence and courage marked out for it in its first issue, as shown in the paragraph kept standing in column 1. We do not expect to have the unvarying approval of any reader. We expect to make some mistakes; we expect at times to be misunderstood. But the star shall guide us, nevertheless, and our mistakes shall be of the head, not of the heart.

And as the paper is not infallible, neither is it an ideal one in other respects. We know that improvements can be made and if our subscribers stand by us as they should these improvements will be made.

And how can the reader aid? By renewing his own subscription promptly at expiration, and putting the paper into new homes in his neighborhood. We think that there are few readers who cannot send us at least one new subscription during the year upon which we have now entered.

Suppose the editor were to go to each reader personally and say to him: "Here are two ways in which you can help The Progressive Farmer. You can watch the date on your label and renew promptly when your subscription expires. You can look over your neighborhood and send us at least one new subscription this year." This message is none the less real and earnest because we deliver it to you through the medium of a printed page; it is the request that we make of you and we trust you will heed it.

We are not infallible; we have made mistakes and will make new ones during this year. But the paper will serve no master, will be ruled by no faction, and the mistakes will be made solely because we fail to see aright the best interests of our constituency.

Farmers of North Carolina and adjoining States, The Progressive Farmer is your paper, "devoted to every interest of the farmer and his family." You can do your part by giving it your individual support and working for its wider circulation and increased influence.

As we go to press late reports indicate that an extra session of Congress will be held shortly after March 4th.

## THE COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

A brief report of the formation of this organization is given in our news columns. A letter just received from Secretary Allison states that President Jordan will soon visit North Carolina to organize this State properly. Mr. Allison adds: "I think we are getting the matter started right."

## ABOUT HOLDING COTTON.

Just after the price of cotton dropped below ten cents early in the marketing season, a number of our esteemed contemporaries published long and labored editorials to show that immediately after Christmas cotton would bound high above the ten cent mark and there remain till spring. "Hold your cotton" was the oft-repeated advice of these self-constituted guardians of the farmer. Doubtless some tillers of the soil thought they were getting superior papers because the editors of the periodicals aforesaid were qualified to advise farmers upon such points, whereas old reliable farm papers such as The Progressive Farmer, were not telling farmers that they held for higher prices.

But now we note that the newspapers afore mentioned are not indulging in any self-congratulatory remarks as to their prophecies. Whenever their predictions come true, they immediately herald it abroad that through their superior wisdom they have saved the agricultural interests so many thousand dollars. Why shouldn't the rule work both ways?

Perhaps after all the paper that makes fewer predictions but never leads its readers into the ditch, is as safe a guide as the false prophet.

## THE SOUTH AND OLEO.

Those cotton farmers who have been led to believe that the Grouse bill would injure the cotton seed industry ought to read Secretary Wilson's speech before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. He shows the matter in its true light as follows:

"Dairying will increase in the mountain states as homesteaders take possession of land on which to raise families, and it will increase in the cotton growing states as farmers realize the necessity of rotations of crops, and the increase of grazers and feeders that come through this industry. The benefit that comes to the cotton growers, through the sale of a little oil to be used in making oleomargarine, is very small compared with the dairying and feeding that must be increased to use the by-product of the cotton seed mills, and the consequent return to the soil of this most valuable of all feeds and fertilizers. The best interests of the cotton seed belt lie in increasing its dairy and feeding interests, rather than in contributing a little oil toward the serious injury of dairying and feeding, that should use all the cotton seed meal produced there."

In another column, Corresponding Editor Emery has a report of a sale of Berkshires at Biltmore Farms. Let those who think it doesn't pay to breed fine stock in North Carolina give it a careful reading.

## RURAL FREE DELIVERY AGAIN

The Progressive Farmer's plea for the extension of the system of rural free delivery in this State at once struck a responsive chord.

The Madison Enterprise commended our article to its readers and urged the people of that mountain county to work for the establishment of one or more routes there.

The Charlotte Observer, knowing the success of the routes already established in progressive Mecklenburg, quoted our editorial and commented as follows: "All of this suggests that the number of free delivery routes in this county should be largely increased. It has the good roads and population on them is thick for a Southern community. The people along the routes already established are delighted with the system, and by effort these routes could be greatly multiplied, to the great benefit of the people whom they would reach."

The Waynesville-Courier says that the system will probably be inaugurated in Haywood at an early date.

The Louisburg Times copied several Progressive Farmer paragraphs and added: "Rural Free Delivery is becoming very popular, and we hear that efforts will soon be made to establish one or more circuits in Franklin county, running out from Louisburg."

In Johnston county petitions are being circulated asking for an extension of the system.

The Dunn Banner is interested and says: "There is not a single route established in Harnett and we believe our people would find it a great blessing. In order to get it established it is necessary for the people

to get up a petition and outline the route. Now if our friends in the country will get the names of those desiring the free delivery we will take great pleasure in assisting them."

And in this connection we ought to give the figures showing the number of pieces of mail delivered and collected on the three Raleigh routes during January, 1901. These figures show a steady, healthy growth and we are glad to give them in connection with figures for preceding months, as already published:

|                      |        |
|----------------------|--------|
| August, 1900.....    | 3,878  |
| September, 1900..... | 6,354  |
| October, 1900.....   | 9,590  |
| November, 1900.....  | 10,897 |
| December, 1900.....  | 10,940 |
| January, 1901.....   | 11,939 |

The action of Mayor Van Wyck, of New York, in refusing to lower the flag on the city hall in honor of the memory of Queen Victoria deserves condemnation as a bit of narrowness entirely at variance with the true American spirit. We are surprised that it is defended by Col. W. J. Bryan in his Commoner.

## UNCLE SAM'S EXPENSES.

Because our National revenues are raised by the insidious methods of indirect taxation, our people are too prone to overlook the enormous expenses of our National government. The fact that appropriations at this session of Congress will reach the enormous sum of \$760,000,000—not only a billion dollar Congress, but almost a billion dollar session—seems to have excited little comment. We do not believe that our government should be run upon parsimonious or miserly principles; the nation is rich and our expenditures are necessarily heavy. Nevertheless, we ought to look carefully into the Congressional budget and hold our public servants to strict accountability in all matters affecting the country's finances. In this connection, we give a few paragraphs from an interesting article, "What the Government Costs," written by Hon. Carroll D. Wright for the Century Century. They can be studied with profit by all voters. Says Mr. Wright:

"A very large proportion of the annual expenses is for pensions, the largest single expense of the federal government. This expenditure was the largest in 1893, when it amounted to \$159,357,557.87. The smallest expenditure since that period was in 1899, when it was \$139,394,929.07; for 1900 it was \$140,877,316. The pension burden in 1893 was \$2.37 per capita, while during the last fiscal year it was \$1.84, which the people of the United States pay to carry out the promises made at the time of the Civil War.

"The expenses of the War Department were the largest in the history of the country in 1865, when they exceeded \$1,000,000,000. In 1871, when the effect of the war and reconstruction had virtually passed away, they were reduced to \$35,99,992. They varied from that period, never exceeding \$19,500,000, until 1894, when they were over \$54,500,000. This point was not reached again until the first year of the Spanish War (1898), when they were nearly \$92,000,000. They were almost \$230,000,000 in 1899, but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, were reduced to \$134,774,767.

"The Navy Department expended in 1871 nearly \$19,500,000. The expenditures varied until 1897, when they were over \$34,500,000; in 1898, nearly \$59,090,000; in 1899, nearly \$84,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1900 \$55,955,078.

"The expenditures on account of the Indians grew gradually from the first half of the century until they reached the highest point in 1893 when they were \$13,345,347.27; they are now over \$10,000,000.

"The greatest expenditure for interest on the public debt was in 1867, being \$143,781,592. This payment gradually decreased until 1892, when it was \$23,378,116.23. It has been gradually increasing since that time, until for the fiscal year 1900 it was \$40,160,333.

The expenditures for civil and miscellaneous items, including the expenses of Congress and all the departments and offices in Washington other than the War and Navy departments and the payments that have already been noted, were in 1871 nearly \$60,500,000. There was not very much change in this amount until 1885, when they reached \$87,500,000, and in 1891 over \$119,000,000. The highest amount paid on this account was in 1899, when it was \$119,191,250. For 1900 it was \$105,773,190."

## THE IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS.

The resolution for the impeachment of Chief Justice David M. Furches and Associate Justice Robert M. Douglas, of the North Carolina Supreme Court, was taken up in the House of Representatives last Thursday morning at 11 o'clock. Its importance is such that we offer no apology for surrendering so much of our space to a report of this matter. We watched the proceedings carefully. Partisan feeling was not so much in evidence as we feared it would be, but it necessarily plays a part in any case involving partisan legislation, as this did. The 1897 Legislature, Fusion, elected Theophilus White Shellfish Commissioner for four years. The 1899 Legislature, Democratic, abolished the office but transferred its duties to other men, further ordering the State Treasurer not to pay White's salary. The Supreme court held that White could not be ousted and issued a mandamus ordering the payment of his salary. The issuance of this mandamus is pronounced the sole cause of impeachment. Messrs. Stubbs and Yarborough, Democratic lawyer-legislators, however, say the judges acted properly in issuing the mandamus, contending further that an error of law, granting that such was made, is not an impeachable offence.

But the resolution has been adopted and the charges of impeachment will be made. The House, it should be said, cannot impeach, but simply prefers charges for the consideration of the Senate, which body will either impeach or acquit. The trial will occupy much time and an extra session of the Legislature will doubtless be called.

The Progressive Farmer has already given its opinion of the whole wretched performance, and it is not necessary to repeat here. In what follows we give merely an unbiased report of the debate in the House and the result.

Exactly at 11 o'clock Thursday the Craig resolution for impeachment was announced as the special order and the clerk read the majority report of the Judiciary Committee recommending the passage of the resolution.

The minority report, which was signed by three Republican members of the Judiciary Committee, was then presented as follows:

"To the Honorable the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina:

"We, whose names are hereto subscribed, the minority of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, respectfully report:

"That we have considered the evidence submitted under the resolution of enquiry in regard to the conduct of former Associate Justice D. M. Furches and Associate Justice R. M. Douglas, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, and have carefully considered the law in relation thereto. Without entering into a detailed statement we are of the opinion that nothing appears in the evidence or in the law relating thereto which justifies any resolution either of impeachment or censure.

"We, therefore, respectfully recommend that the House take no further action in regard thereto.

"I. W. EBBES,  
"O. V. F. BLYTHE,  
"F. B. BENBOW."

Judge Connor offered as a substitute for the whole matter the following joint resolution of disapproval: "Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring: "That in issuing a mandamus to the State Auditor and State Treasurer in the case of Theophilus White vs. H. W. Ayer, State Auditor, and W. H. Worth, State Treasurer, lately before it pending, the Supreme Court, a majority thereof concurring, assumed authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws of the State, but in derogation thereof."

Mr. Allen, of Wayne, then sent forward the following amendment to the Connor resolution:

"That said judges, David M. Furches, formerly Associate Justice and now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Robert M. Douglas, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors in office."

The debate then began.

Judge Allen spoke first in favor of impeachment. The resolution was referred to a sub-committee. The committee found four violations of law by the court and two infractions of the Constitution itself. The facts agreed upon by that committee were the same. Every member was unani-

mous as to the facts. Only one Democratic member disagreed as to the law in the case. As I understand it impeachment is a court of inquiry. It is an inquest of office. There is no punishment. I hear people say it is a political trial. So it is. But it is not a partisan political matter. It is an inquiry into their political duty as officers of the great State of North Carolina. When we know of facts and know the law, we cannot escape the conclusion that our oath requires of us. Knowing the facts in this case we cannot escape the duty of impeaching these judges of high crimes and misdemeanors."

Mr. Stubbs, of Martin, made an eloquent and able plea against impeachment. "The only difference between what the Legislatures of 1895 and 1897 did and the action of the Legislature of 1899 was that the Fusionists were bolder. They openly attempted to take the offices held by Wood and other Democrats. We were more astute. We clothed the purpose of the act of 1899 with different verbiage and legal phraseology. We were trying to take from a man his office and rights, which had been given him for four years. It is unlawful to take a man's office from him; it is unlawful to starve him out of an office. We have then the spectacle of a gentleman holding an office under the highest legislative and judicial authority and the Legislature saying he shall have no pay for it. The mandamus simply gave a remedy to a citizen and officer of the State, who otherwise was remediless."

Judge Graham, of Granville, and Mr. Seawell, of Moore, followed, arguing for impeachment.

Mr. Connor then made an eloquent argument for his resolution.

"The action of President Jackson in removing the deposits was more serious than that charged here, and the Senate of the United States did not impeach him. All that body did was to disapprove of his action by resolution."

Mr. Craig—"Was not that resolution later expunged from the record like yours when it came before the committee?"

Mr. Connor—"I am afraid the time will come if this Legislature doesn't act wisely and considerably, that some things we do here will be expunged from the record."

Mr. Craig—"Didn't Judge Furches in the Jordan decision say that he would not pay any attention to action by the Legislature?"

Mr. Connor—"You refer to the decision in which he said the fear of impeachment would not deter him from his duty?"

Mr. Craig—"Yes."

Mr. Connor—"I respect Judge Furches for that utterance. He deserves credit for making that statement. If he had said otherwise I would have been in favor of going to the court room and driving him from the bench as a coward."

Mr. Connor thought the judges had acted illegally but did not favor impeachment.

On Friday Mr. Rountree opened the debate with a long speech in favor of impeachment. He did not think it necessary to prove corruption to find cause for this action. If partisan bias caused them to err, they nevertheless deserved impeachment. They could have rendered these decisions relating to offices as long as they pleased, but when they plunged their hands into the public treasury they violated the Constitution. We are not impeaching for the partisan decisions of the court, but for a flat violation of the Constitution. And I want to say here that the opinions of the court were most flippant."

Mr. Simms of Wake said: "I know that if \$831 in the State treasury is subject to the mandamus of these men they may lay their unhallowed hands upon every cent the coffers hold. I cannot vote for impeachment in the first place, because I do not believe that it is the wisest thing to do, but if you vote down this milder measure and force me to decide solely whether this house shall impeach or drop the matter and be silent altogether I shall vote to impeach. But while I believe that impeachment is better than silence, I believe that protest is better than impeachment, and I shall vote in the first place for a protest."

Mr. McLean, of Scotland, announced that Mr. Simms' speech had decided him to oppose impeachment. Messrs. Smith, of Gates, Hayes, Winston and Zachary then spoke in favor of impeachment.

Mr. Morgan, of Johnston, opposed

the resolution and Mr. Dula, of Mecklenburg, said he had changed his mind and would have to vote merely for the resolution of protest believing the judges were not guilty of corruption and that they should not be impeached for a mistake of law.

Mr. Whitaker, of Forsyth, opened the discussion Saturday, speaking for impeachment.

Mr. Yarborough, of Franklin, made a strong argument against impeachment. The constitution is the supreme law of the State and the Legislature has a right to violate it. In 1897 a Legislature of North Carolina appointed Theophilus White an office for a term of four years. In 1899 another Legislature was elected and passed an act, designed to take away from Theophilus White his office, which was his property under the constitution and laws of North Carolina. When a Legislature has entered into contract with a man to fulfill the duties of an office no Legislature has a constitutional right to oust him from office or starve him out. What is the cause of the proposed extreme action? Has any public scandal been noted? Has life and liberty been endangered by the Supreme Court? No. The history has there been an impeachment in which there was not a high crime or misdemeanor, which has attracted public attention and roused the wrath of the people. Can it be possible that here in the dawn of the twentieth century of Christian civilization, judges of the Supreme Court are to be impeached for an error of law, or for a case about which lawyers differ? What is the result of the "high crime or misdemeanor?" Simply a man who has been appointed to an office kept in office and drew the pay.

Mr. Blalock, of Stanly, thought the constitution about all we had left. He favored impeachment.

Mr. Patterson, of Robeson, spoke next. He said he could not agree with the report of the subcommittee on judiciary, either in its report of facts or law. This proposition, fraught with more danger to the people of North Carolina than anything that has come before us, is surprising. We are not stopping to think. They say we are sitting on grand jury; let us remember the charge: "You shall present no charges for envy, hatred or malice." Let us consider. I was a member of the Legislature of 1899 and I fear that have resentment against the judges of the Supreme Court. Have you hatred against them? I fear that you have because of some of the acts. Are we doing this for hatred or for malice? Let us consider. We have made pledges to the people of North Carolina, we have promised to work to stop political strife and hatred. Shall we keep them? We decided that because the Supreme Court decided political questions different from what you believe they should be impeached. That is the way the people of North Carolina are going to look at it.

Mr. Stewart, of Harnett, made an impassioned speech in favor of impeachment. He thought that the people's rights were always trampled away gradually, and that the slightest error should be severely rebuked.

Mr. Sheets, Rep., of Davie, paid a high tribute to Chief Justice Furches' ability, integrity and high character. He was the first Republican to make himself heard upon the matter, and the members heretofore mentioned in this article being Democrats.

Representative Jenkins, of Granville, next addressed the House making a rather humorous talk. He favored impeachment.

Representative Whitaker, of Guilford, then spoke, testifying to the high character of Judge Douglas, a constituent of his, though of different political faith. He thought impeachment unjust and unwise.

At 2 o'clock it looked as if a vote would be taken but the Republicans insisted upon being heard and the House adjourned till Monday, 18th.

And Monday's proceedings were no means dull. We regret that press of space and the lateness of the hour prevent our giving a full report. Beginning at 10 o'clock the Republican members, led by Mr. Ebbes, devoted nearly three hours to earnest arguments against impeachment. Mr. Craig, the author of the resolution followed in a skillful argument in its behalf. Shortly after 2 p. m. Monday, 18th, the vote was taken on the resolution, as was generally expected, passed by a safe majority. We are informed, just as we go to press.

The full vote will be given in our next issue.